

Court in the future, which Justice Ginsburg herself opposed and warned would make the Court partisan, because if Democrats decide to add additional members to the U.S. Supreme Court when they are in power, then the pressure will be irresistible for Republicans to add other Justices to the Court, and it would look—and it would be clearly a partisan institution rather than an impartial judge of the law and the facts.

The President has every right to put forth a nomination, and we have an obligation to give him or her due consideration under our advice and consent responsibilities. As always, we will be thorough, and I hope, unlike last time, we can be civil and treat all with respect.

I am prepared to fulfill my responsibilities as a Member of this body and of the Judiciary Committee, and I hope our colleagues on both sides are prepared to do the same thing.

JENNA QUINN LAW

Madam President, there is no question that this has been a difficult year for our country, with division and disagreement taking center stage. That changed for a moment last week when the Senate unanimously passed a bill that I had introduced called the Jenna Quinn Law to protect some of the most vulnerable members of our country.

This bill carries the name of an inspiring young Texan who is one of 42 million adult survivors of child sexual abuse nationwide. As Jenna says, child sexual abuse is a silent epidemic. One in four girls and one in six boys are sexually abused before the age of 18. Those are shocking numbers. Sadly, these victims often stay silent for months, years, some for even a lifetime. As a result, they and countless other victims continue to be subject to abuse.

Interrupting this cycle of sexual abuse is Jenna's mission and one she has devoted her life to pursuing. She was the driving force behind what is now known as Jenna's Law in Texas, which requires training for teachers, caregivers, and other adults who work with children on how to recognize and report child sexual abuse.

The signs of child sexual abuse are unique from other forms of abuse, and correctly identifying these signs is integral to bringing children out of a sexually abusive situation.

After the Texas law passed in 2009, a study found that educators reported child sexual abuse at a rate almost four times greater after training than during their pretraining career—four times greater. It was one of the first child sexual abuse prevention laws in the United States to mandate this kind of training.

Now, more than half of all the States have adopted a form of Jenna's Law, but many States, including my State, which have passed these laws don't provide the funding for the training. Thanks to the legislation that passed the Senate unanimously last week, that is one step closer to occurring.

The Jenna Quinn law will take the successful reforms in Texas and other States and finally back them with some Federal funding for that essential training. It will still allow current grant funds from the Department of Justice, for example, to be used for specialized training for students, teachers, and caregivers to learn how to identify, safely report, and hopefully prevent future child sexual abuse.

This legislation also encourages States with similar laws to implement innovative programs to address and discourage child sexual abuse. It is a critical step to interrupting this cycle that is impacting children across the country and preventing more children from enduring this trauma.

My partner in this bipartisan effort was Senator HASSAN from New Hampshire, and I appreciate her help in moving this bill through the Senate. I hope our colleagues in the House will quickly take it up and pass the Jenna Quinn law so we can get it to the President's desk as soon as possible.

The COVID-19 crisis has underscored the urgency of this legislation. In April of this year, nationwide reports of abuse or neglect dropped by an average of 40 percent compared to the same time last year. Normally, this type of drop in reporting would be great news, but based on everything we know about the stresses and circumstances created by this pandemic, I fear that there is actually an increase in abuse. It just isn't being recognized or reported. We need to make investments now in the health and safety of our children and bring this silent epidemic to an end.

Speaker PELOSI has made clear that the House will stay in session until an agreement is reached on COVID-19 relief so there is no reason for the House not to be able to act on this consensus legislation. I urge the House to take it up and pass it—which has received unanimous support in the Senate—and support America's children at a critical time like this.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

REMEMBERING JUSTICE RUTH BADER GINSBURG

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this weekend the United States of America passed a sad milestone—200,000 recorded deaths from COVID-19.

We are a nation in mourning. In addition to 200,000 family, friends, and neighbors we have now lost to this brutal pandemic, America is also mourning the loss of a historic champion of equality, a woman who spent her entire life, every ounce of her strength and talent she was given, in pursuit of

America's highest ideal: equal justice under the law.

Jewish teaching says that those who die just before the Jewish New Year are those whom God has held back until the last moment because they were most needed on Earth. So it seems fitting that Ruth Bader Ginsburg left this world as the Sun was setting last Friday, marking the start of Rosh Hashanah.

Years before, Ruth Bader Ginsburg made history as only the second woman ever to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court. Even at that time, she had already earned an enduring place in American history. She has been called the Thurgood Marshall of the gender equality movement. As a lawyer and law professor, she was the mastermind in the 1970s behind a legal strategy that finally began to dismantle an American legal system that treated women in many ways as second-class citizens. Law Professor David Cole called her strategy “radical incrementalism.”

It is hard today for many Americans to imagine how deeply entrenched and how commonly accepted gender discrimination was in American law—and American society—before Ruth Bader Ginsburg began her legal crusade to make real for women the words carved above the doors of the U.S. Supreme Court: “Equal Justice Under Law.” The legal challenges she brought changed the way the world is for women and for all Americans.

Before she began her legal crusade, women were treated, by law, differently than men. Hundreds of State and Federal laws and programs restricted what women could do. Many jobs were legally closed to women. Many basic economic, social, and legal rights that we now take for granted were legally denied to women for no reason other than gender.

Before the legal victories achieved by Ruth Bader Ginsburg, a woman often could not—on her own—buy a car, open a checking account, get a credit card, sign a lease, obtain a mortgage, buy real estate, open a business, or obtain a business loan. She needed a man to co-sign.

Before Ruth Bader Ginsburg, women could be—and were—barred from public institutions and excluded from whole professions. They could be demoted or fired if they became pregnant. In fact, Ruth Bader Ginsburg herself was forced to accept a lower paying job at the Social Security Administration when she became pregnant, at the age of 21, with her first child.

Her legal strategy was cautious and strategic. Knowing that she needed to persuade mostly male judges—including an all-male Supreme Court—she chose cases that illustrated how gender discrimination can also harm men. She took up the case of a young widower whose wife died in childbirth. The man wanted to stay home to raise his son but was denied Social Security survivor benefits because such benefits by law could only go to widows.